

1. Stakeholders – PEO C3T (COMMO) and PEO IEWS (GPS) are missing from your charts.

**A: Thank you.**

2. How will Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV) integrate a Global Positioning System (GPS) solution?

**A: We currently anticipate using the Defense Advanced GPS Receiver (DAGR) provided to M113-equipped units. That may change as government-provided GPS solutions change.**

3. Will the AMPV integrate PM-PNT's new developments in a GPS fanout box?

**A: Our information architecture is defined by Army Capability Set requirements. Should a GPS fanout box be part of the architecture, it will be integrated into a future mission equipment package update.**

4. @ 1-1.7m/unit will the winner be provided platforms for integration?

**A: United States Government (USG) will provide Bradley or M113 hulls upon request. If the bidder opts to provide their own platform, the cost will have to fit within the \$1-\$1.7M target**

5. If no "seed" vehicles are available for production, doesn't this make Stryker solution a non-starter?

**A: Stryker is still a viable option provided it meets vehicle performance requirements and can be delivered within the required affordability targets.**

6. Will compliance with the Army's victory spec be a requirement for AMPV - or is that considered "fuzzy dice"?

**A: Requirements have not been finalized. They are TBD.**

7. What, if any, involvement is expected from other services (Marines) or forces (FMS, Canada, UK)?

**A: There are currently no plans to make this program either Joint or International, though that could change should other services or countries express serious interest.**

8. Are the power requirements based on the existing engine specifications?

**A: Power requirements are independent of system or powertrain solutions – they simply document the power draw requirements of network and mission equipment packages as currently configured.**

9. Is the intent to be one award for all five Mission Equipment Packages – or will the award be split?

**A: We are still working on the acquisition strategy at this time.**

10. Since there are two roles for the Mission Command vehicle, will two different vehicles be specified or will one vehicle fill both roles?

**A: As the Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) is still ongoing and requirements are not final we cannot give a definitive answer at this time. If the final outcome is two distinct sets of requirements, a best value decision will be made as to whether one or two vehicle solutions are appropriate.**

11. Is there a desired product maturity level for the entry into the AMPV program?

**A: The Army would prefer to accelerate its schedule as much as possible. Factors that may affect acceleration are system maturity and the level of qualification testing required to achieve production readiness. The standard guideline is Technology Readiness Level (TRL) 6 or above.**

12. Will Performance Spec / Requirements information be released prior to target of no earlier than 1QFY13 and no later than 3QFY13?

**A: We currently intend to release a draft performance specification at or before the next Industry Day event to solicit additional Industry feedback.**

13. Will the results of the AoA be published for industry review?

**A: Elements of the AoA are classified and, therefore, it will not be released to the public. However, key insights may be shared with industry in the future.**

14. If the contractor solution is not based on Bradley or M113, when and how will we get information necessary for Mission Equipment Package (MEP) design integration?

**A: The Army currently intends to make technical integration data (Interface Control Documents, for example) available for the Mission Equipment Packages to enable contractors to assess and plan their submissions. MEP data is not linked to the offer to provide Bradley or M113 hulls as GFE.**

15. What is the schedule for developing requirements and AMPV for Echelons Above Brigade (EAB)?

**A: The Echelons Above Brigade decision is currently an FY16 decision point.**

16. Lubricants, Engine, Drive Train and HVAC Systems:

- How/who are they sourced?
- Path to get approved?
- How do we present new technology for current and new vehicle programs (AMPV)?
- TACOM contact for lubricants – development and service purchase?

**A: Contractors must determine and propose their own technical solutions. Risk and cost associated with new technology qualification may be a consideration in the Request for Proposal (RFP). If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

17. How will the Army handle new technologies being developed by other PMs (such as WIN-T Light or DVE-Wide) on the AMPV program?

**A: Other Army programs that are directed to be integrated to AMPV will either be delivered as Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) by the parent program, or directed for integration post-contract award.**

18. Will the competition require delivery of bid samples or will it be a pure “paper competition”?

**A: That is still to be determined. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

19. Will there be single awards for each mission role or multiple awards for mission roles and then down-select?

**A. That is still to be determined, and may ultimately depend on the cost of various submissions. Current program plans assume one award per mission role.**

20. Can all GFE MEP equipment be assumed to not be included in Average Unit Manufacturing Cost (AUMC)?

**A: The cost of MEP provided as GFE will not be assessed against AUMC. Integration cost of that MEP, as well as any integration requirements unique to the vehicle solution (brackets, cables, etc.), will be.**

21. If contractor solution is not Bradley or M113 based, how will MEP access be provided to those contractors?

**A: The Army intends to make MEP interface data available to all contractors regardless of type of vehicle submission. MEP access will also be provided. Please check the website for future information on when and how. (Appropriate security clearance will be required to access data).**

22. Will integration of Mission Equipment, Size, Weight, and Power – Cooling (SWAP-C) drivers, be facilitated through a VCD (Vehicle Common Display / Smart Display) or through a ruggedized computer with display interfaces?

**A: That is up to the individual contractor to determine. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

23. How many displays will be needed? Sizes and resolution?

**A: That is up to the individual contractor to determine. More information will be forthcoming in the performance specification (i.e., number of workstations, number of crew stations, human factor requirements, etc.). If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

24. Does AUMC include cost of armor?

**A: Yes. Some excess GFM (i.e., BRAT, M113 Slat Armor kits) may be provided. Details on quantities and parts will be provided at a later date. GFM will not be included in the AUMC. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

25. Are you looking to upgrade armor or use existing package? If using existing package, will the Armor Technical Data Package (TDP) be released and open for bid?

**A: The bidder is responsible for proposing an armor package. The bidder can upgrade the armor or use an existing package to meet the force protection requirements. The USG will not be providing an armor TDP. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

26. Will the AMPV Scope of Work (SOW) include recapitalization of the candidate vehicle (assuming an existing asset) or will this be done separately? For example, if a Bradley is used, will we perform recap or will the Army provide a Bradley that has already been recapped? In other words, are we going to get new assets to convert, or recapped assets, or used assets that we must recap prior to conversion?

**A: If a bidder's solution assumes use of an existing Army capital asset (Bradley, M113), that system should be assumed to be provided "as is" – the contractor must assume an appropriate level of recapitalization. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

27. Will the AMPV receive the new AN/VIC-5 intercom rather than the AN/VIC-3 if it is ready to be fielded?

**A: Current plans assume reuse of M113 VIC-3 systems; however, substitution of VIC-5 is acceptable given the planned qualification of that system.**

28. Regarding the HVAC system, are there requirements for vehicle insulation?

**A: The means of providing the best combination of solutions to achieve required cooling is left to the contractor. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

29. Does the AMPV (any/all of variants) have a 360-degree Situational Awareness requirement?

**A: Final requirements are still pending completion of the AoA and final approval, but at this time there is no threshold requirement for "360-degree Situational Awareness," as it is commonly interpreted (i.e., a 360-degree remote camera solution of some type). If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

30. Is it possible to obtain a list of AMPV Industry Day attendees?

**A: We will take this under consideration. Attendees would need to "opt in" to having their information released. We are in the process of asking attendees if they would like their information released.**

31. Is all protection integral to platform – or will there be SWAP, weight margin, etc., for kit appliqué?

**A: Kitting of protection requirements is still TBD. At this time, requirements do not prevent the use of kit or appliqué solutions for protection, provided the base vehicle is able to receive them and meet required performance with kits installed.**

32. Will DVE be provided as GFE?

**A: This is TBD.**

33. I did not see the words "Stryker" or SBCT on any slides – does this mean a Stryker-based solution is off the table?

**A: No. Stryker may be a viable candidate for one or all mission roles, provided it meets performance and affordability requirements. It was not explicitly mentioned, as the Army does not have excess Stryker vehicles to provide to bidders as production seeds.**

34. What is the most likely Indirect Fire (IDF), Direct Fire (DF), and Under Belly (UB) threat?

**A: This information is classified.**

35. What is the AUMC of the M113? And Bradley?

**A: The USG does not intend to release this information.**

36. Are the Mission Packages (General Purpose, etc.) to be provided as GFE and will the integration decisions be the Government's?

**A: The government intends to provide some MEP GFE (specific examples include radio/network equipment and M1064 mortar MEP, assuming a bidder submission can integrate it). The method of integration is to be left to the contractor. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

37. Should Bradley or M113 vehicle-based solutions win, and "seed" hulls provided – will the "seed" hulls be provided free of charge? If not, what will be the charges? (*Example: basehulls, transportation, teardown, etc.*)

**A: That is still TBD. We anticipate that hulls will be provided in "as is" condition. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

38. What PM is responsible for force protection for the AMPVs?

**A: Product Manager AMPV will be responsible for total system performance.**

39. Will you consider new technology that reduces the solar loading of the AMPV thereby reducing fuel consumption?

**A: The means of achieving specific technical performance objectives are left to the contractor to determine. Risks and costs associated with new technology may be evaluated in the RFP. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

40. Other than the estimated wattage requirements, are there any additional Environmental Cooling Unit (ECU) requirements either general or specific that you can elaborate on?

**A: Requirements are still in development and should be provided when the draft performance specification is released. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

41. Are the HVAC/ECU requirements in Tier 2 or Tier 3?

**A: That is still TBD. This could be tiered differently base on mission role.**

42. If the Army goes into a third maneuver battalion, what will change as far as numbers for the individual vehicle quantities for the various roles?

**A: Army future force structure is still TBD. We estimate, however, that addition of a third maneuver battalion to a brigade will be resourced by the deactivation of brigades rather than creation of new battalions, so this will likely result in a requirement for fewer AMPVs.**

43. What is the range of O&S costs the vehicle must operate? Is this a KPP? Is it weighted as highly as the AUMC?

**A: O&S targets are still TBD. This will be considered in conjunction with other costs as part of life cycle cost assessment. Relative weight to AUMC is TBD.**

44. What are the operational energy efficiencies that the vehicle must perform?

**A: This is TBD. The requirement will be released at a later date.**

45. Will the bailment Bradleys / M113s include a TDP?

**A: The Army intends to provide technical data with GFE hulls to the extent its data rights permit. This data may not be fully complete.**

46. What is the deadline for White Papers?

**A: The Army will continue to accept White Papers through the next Industry Day event. However, the later a White Paper is submitted, the less time it has for consideration and, hence, the lower the likelihood that it may influence requirements or acquisition strategy.**

47. Will Government armor solutions be provided to OEMs?

**A: Some excess GFM (i.e., BRAT, M113 Slat Armor kits) may be provided. Details on quantities and parts will be provided at a later date. GFM will not be included in the AUMC. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

48. What model of Bradley cores will be available? What quantity?

**A: Final availability of Bradley hulls depends on force structure decisions, but currently the Army has excess Bradley A0, A1, A2, and A2 ODS hulls. Additional A3/ODS-SA hulls, sufficient to meet**

the full AMPV requirement, are expected to be made available once GCV fields and displaces M2A3 IFVs.

49. Are electronic models available for Bradley cores?

**A: The Army has CAD files for Bradley hulls it can share.**

50. When can we get or see the protection level needed for this program?

**A: Not later than release of the draft performance specification, assuming demonstration of the ability to access classified performance data.**

51. Will the PM enforce a protection solution on the OEMs?

**A: Protection requirements will be provided in the performance specification. The PM is not enforcing a specific protection solution. Already existing protection kits can be part of the overall solution if the contractor wants them.**

52. Does the HBCT customer want pure track? Or a mix of track and wheel (BOE TOC and Med Treat) as wheel?

**A: Any solution that meets performance and affordability criteria will be considered, whether wheeled, tracked, or other.**

53. Please address occupant protection requirements for other than blast and ballistic events – crash, rollover, severe off-road driving, etc.

**A: We will have seating and restraint requirements within the performance specification. These requirements and applicable MIL STDs will define those other areas besides ballistic protection.**

54. Will there be any exportable power requirements?

**A: AoA and requirements refinement is still underway and this is TBD. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

55. When will MEP packages be available to look at?

**A: We are consolidating equipment and data at this time; please monitor the website for future details about availability and access.**



56. When will Bradley / M113 seeds be available to look at?

**A: We are consolidating equipment and data at this time; please monitor the website for future details about availability and access.**

57. When will the EAB acquisition effort begin?

**A: The EAB decision is currently scheduled for FY16. Acquisition will depend on the outcome of that decision.**

58. What systems will be a part of EAB acquisition?

**A: The EAB decision is expected to address M113 mission roles in non-HBCT units – to include Mission Command vehicles in Fires Brigades and EAB headquarters units, additional Medical Evacuation, Smoke, and Combat Engineer formations.**

59. What role does Caiman HAGA play in AMPV? *(per Stakeholders slide)*

**A: The Mission Equipment Package requirement for the Medical Evacuation Vehicle will be similar to that procured for the MRAP Heavy Armored Ground Ambulance (HAGA) program, which is supplying the MEP specifications.**

60. Will experienced personnel for each mission be accessible for interviews and questioning of equipment use?

**A: We will consider this suggestion for a future event.**

61. Would the cost of the seed vehicle be part of the \$1–1.7M AUMC?

**A: Yes, exclusive of any GFM.**

62. Do you anticipate multiple EMD awards like JLTV?

**A: This decision is still TBD.**

63. Understanding that currently, the direction is to harvest existing MEPs to save cost and schedule – but will there be exceptions made for systems facing obsolescence and well past the planned date for entering sustainment? *(example: VIC-3)*

**A: Potentially, yes, for systems no longer able to be sustained. Bidders are welcome to submit their preferred system solutions. Risk and cost will be factors considered in evaluation. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

64. How many "seed" assets of Bradley and M113 are available for production?

**A: Sufficient Bradley and M113 assets will be available to meet the AMPV requirements outlined in the briefing.**

65. Are there Life Cycle cost objectives in requirements?

**A: We anticipate Operating and Support cost targets, which are still TBD.**

66. Will other program costs (for example: RDTE) be identified as potential trade-off points for analysis of the potential award?

**A: Specific evaluation criteria will be revealed at a later date. Potential evaluated costs could include development costs, low rate initial production (LRIP) costs, O&S costs, and total lifecycle costs. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

67. Is WIN-T the only concern with regards to the need for additional SWAP-C within the M113 fleet? What other capabilities have an identified gap?

**A: CREW devices (e.g. Duke v3), modern medical mission equipment packages, and medical vehicle crew cooling requirements are particular power challenges for the M113 fleet.**

68. Will a Draft RFP be released by 1QFY13 for industry Q&A? Or does USG intend to release a Draft RFP with P-Spec prior to next Industry Day?

**A: Our goal is to provide a draft performance specification for industry comment by the next Industry Day. A draft RFP will not be available before a Milestone Decision Authority decision to proceed to formal acquisition.**

69. Please explain how AMPV will be used across the HBCT OMS/MP. Can HBCT provide additional details of how each of the AMPV variants will be used? Can the Operational View (OV1) be provided?

**A: We will replace the M113 mission roles and, hence, those areas of the OMS/MP.**

70. Please define the commonality requirement for HBCT. Is the intent commonality of existing HBCT platforms, or existing U.S. Army platforms? Can criteria for commonality be defined? *(for example: Breadth or quantity of Spare Line items vs. Depth or quantity of each line item)*

**A: Specific commonality requirements are still in development. However, the primary concern is to minimize any additional logistics burden on the operational formation first, and then secondarily, the Army supply system. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

71. Has the Government identified contract types for the EMD / LRIP contract? If so, what is being considered? If not, when will contract type be determined?

**A: The contract type is TBD. "Better Buying Power" initiatives place a strong emphasis on incentive-type contracts.**

72. Survivability was never mentioned specifically. Force protection was the focus – and is it interchangeable with survivability? Or is survivability inherent in force protection?

**A: Force Protection speaks specifically to the protection of the vehicle crew and passengers in an attack, while Survivability addresses the vehicle's ability to continue to function after being attacked. AMPV will have requirements for both, but M113 capability gaps and current lessons learned favor Force Protection over Survivability.**

73. What components or systems will be provided as GFM? *(And therefore not included in the target cost.)*

**A: This is still being defined and is TBD.**

74. What is defined to be included in the \$1-1.7M platform? What components / systems?

**A: All components, integration items and systems required to provide a fully functioning, operational vehicle, to include on-vehicle spares, stores, integration of GFM, and basic issue items, but exclusive of government-furnished equipment/materials, spares, training aids/devices, special maintenance tooling, and training and war reserve ammunition.**

75. If Bradley / M113 hull is GFE'd to contractor, what reliability and durability is expected of GFE components?

**A: The contractor is responsible for delivering system-level performance.**

76. Can electrical power required be defined by operational mode? *(for example: Engine Idle Stationary, 2-5 MPH Operational, Tactical Idle, etc.)*

**A: Requirements will be for worst case, as defined in the performance specification, with a percentage of growth margin.**

77. Will M1 / M2 performance be defined as a Tier 1 requirement? If so, will HARD requirement be defined? (for example: TE/WT cooling point, minimum speed on GRADE, etc.)

**A: Specific tiering of requirements is still TBD. If you have specific thoughts or suggestions on this issue, we suggest submission of a white paper for consideration.**

78. What items does the Army believe will be GFM assuming a Bradley-based solution?

**A: GFM lists are still TBD.**

79. What items does the Army believe will be GFM assuming a MRAP-based solution?

**A: GFM lists are still TBD.**

80. Will a list of attendees be posted to allow sub-vendors to identify potential OEMs?

**A: We will take this under consideration. Attendees would need to “opt in” to having their information released. We are in the process of asking attendees if they would like their information released.**

81. Is the Army interested in a white paper on noise control for the AMPV? Are there noise limits being set for this program? Will a list of interested vendors be provided?

**A: All White Papers that are submitted will be considered. The Army will continue to accept White Papers through the next Industry Day event. However, the later a White Paper is submitted, the less time it has for consideration and, hence, the lower the likelihood that it may influence requirements or acquisition strategy. Noise limits will be included in the performance specification, which is currently being developed. Attendees at Industry Day would need to “opt in” to having their information released. We are in the process of asking attendees if they would like their information released.**